

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 MARIE PATTON,

11 Plaintiff,

No. CIV-S-05-0232 FCD GGH PS

12 vs.

13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT  
14 COURT, EASTERN DISTRICT  
OF CALIFORNIA,

15 Defendants.

ORDER

16 \_\_\_\_\_/  
17 On April 22, 2005, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations  
18 herein which were served on the parties and which contained notice that any objections to the  
19 findings and recommendations were to be filed within ten days. No objections were filed.

20 Accordingly, the court presumes any findings of fact are correct. See Orland v.  
21 United States, 602 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1999). The magistrate judge's conclusions of law are  
22 reviewed de novo. See Britt v. Simi Valley Unified School Dist., 708 F.2d 452, 454 (9th Cir.  
23 1983).

24 The court has reviewed the applicable legal standards and, good cause appearing,  
25 concludes that it is appropriate to adopt the Proposed Findings and Recommendations in full.

26 \\\

Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that:

1. The Proposed Findings and Recommendations filed April 22, 2005, are ADOPTED; and
2. This action is dismissed.

DATED: May 27, 2005

/s/ Frank C. Damrell Jr.  
FRANK C. DAMRELL JR.  
United States District Judge

patton232jo